

NORMALISERS OF ABELIAN IDEALS OF A BOREL SUBALGEBRA AND $\mathbb{Z}$ -GRADINGS OF A SIMPLE LIE ALGEBRA

DMITRI I. PANYUSHEV

ABSTRACT. Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be a simple Lie algebra and $\mathfrak{Ab}$ the poset of all abelian ideals of a fixed Borel subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$. If $\mathfrak{a} \in \mathfrak{Ab}$, then the normaliser of $\mathfrak{a}$ is a standard parabolic subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$. We give an explicit description of the normaliser for a class of abelian ideals that includes all maximal abelian ideals. We also elaborate on a relationship between abelian ideals and $\mathbb{Z}$ -gradings of $\mathfrak{g}$ associated with their normalisers.

INTRODUCTION

Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be a complex simple Lie algebra with a triangular decomposition $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{u} \oplus \mathfrak{t} \oplus \mathfrak{u}^-$, where $\mathfrak{t}$ is a fixed Cartan subalgebra and $\mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{u} \oplus \mathfrak{t}$ is a fixed Borel subalgebra. A subspace $\mathfrak{a} \subset \mathfrak{b}$ is an *abelian ideal* if $[\mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{a}] \subset \mathfrak{a}$ and $[\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{a}] = 0$. Then $\mathfrak{a} \subset \mathfrak{u}$. The general theory of abelian ideals of $\mathfrak{b}$ is based on their relations with the so-called *minuscule elements* of the affine Weyl group $\widehat{W}$, which is due to D. Peterson (see Kostant's account in [6]). The subsequent development has lead to a number of spectacular results of combinatorial and representation-theoretic nature, see e.g. [2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 10, 13, 14].

The normaliser of $\mathfrak{a}$ in $\mathfrak{g}$, denoted $\mathfrak{n}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{a})$, contains $\mathfrak{b}$, i.e., it is a *standard* parabolic subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$. In this note, we study the normalisers of abelian ideals using the corresponding minuscule elements of $\widehat{W}$ and $\mathbb{Z}$ -gradings of $\mathfrak{g}$.

Let Δ be the root system of $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{t})$, Δ^+ the set of positive roots corresponding to $\mathfrak{u}$, Π the set of simple roots in Δ^+ , and θ the highest root in Δ^+ . Then W is the Weyl group and $\mathfrak{g}_{\gamma}$ is the root space for $\gamma \in \Delta$. We write $\mathfrak{Ab} = \mathfrak{Ab}(\mathfrak{g})$ for the set of all abelian ideals of $\mathfrak{b}$ and think of $\mathfrak{Ab}$ as poset with respect to inclusion. Since $\mathfrak{a} \in \mathfrak{Ab}$ is a sum of certain root spaces of $\mathfrak{u}$, we often identify such an $\mathfrak{a}$ with the corresponding subset $I = I_{\mathfrak{a}}$ of Δ^+ .

Let $\mathfrak{Ab}^{\circ}$ denote the set of nonzero abelian ideals and Δ_l^+ the set of long positive roots. In [8, Sect. 2], we defined a surjective mapping $\tau : \mathfrak{Ab}^{\circ} \rightarrow \Delta_l^+$ and studied its fibres. If $\tau(\mathfrak{a}) = \mu$, then $\mu \in \Delta_l^+$ is called the *rootlet* of $\mathfrak{a}$. Letting $\mathfrak{Ab}_{\mu} = \tau^{-1}(\mu)$, we get a partition of $\mathfrak{Ab}^{\circ}$ parameterised by Δ_l^+ . Each fibre $\mathfrak{Ab}_{\mu}$ is a sub-poset of $\mathfrak{Ab}$. By [8, Sect. 3], the poset $\mathfrak{Ab}_{\mu}$ has a unique minimal and unique maximal element for any $\mu \in \Delta_l^+$. These are denoted by $\mathfrak{a}(\mu)_{\min}$ and $\mathfrak{a}(\mu)_{\max}$, respectively. The corresponding sets of positive roots are $I(\mu)_{\min}$ and $I(\mu)_{\max}$. The abelian ideals of the form $\mathfrak{a}(\mu)_{\min}$ (resp. $\mathfrak{a}(\mu)_{\max}$) will be referred to as

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 17B20, 17B22, 20F55.

Key words and phrases. Root system, Borel subalgebra, minuscule element, abelian ideal.

the *root-minimal* (resp. *root-maximal*). The set of globally maximal abelian ideals coincides with $\{\mathfrak{a}(\alpha)_{max} \mid \alpha \in \Pi_l\}$, where $\Pi_l = \Delta_l^+ \cap \Pi$ [8, Cor. 3.8].

If $\mathfrak{p} \supset \mathfrak{b}$, then a Levi subalgebra $\mathfrak{l}$ of $\mathfrak{p}$ is said to be *standard*, if $\mathfrak{l} \supset \mathfrak{t}$. Set $\mathfrak{p}[\mu]_{min} = \mathfrak{n}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{a}(\mu)_{min})$ and $\mathfrak{p}[\mu]_{max} = \mathfrak{n}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{a}(\mu)_{max})$. Write $\Pi[\mu]_{min}$ for the simple roots of the standard Levi subalgebra of $\mathfrak{p}[\mu]_{min}$, and likewise for ‘max’. Our main results are the following:

I. We explicitly describe $\Pi[\mu]_{min}$ for any root-minimal ideal $\mathfrak{a}(\mu)_{min}$. The answer is given in terms of the element $w_{\mu} \in W$ that takes θ to μ and has minimal possible length, see Theorem 2.3. The elements w_{μ} have already been considered in [8], and we also provide here new properties of them. Furthermore, if θ is fundamental and $\alpha_{\theta} \in \Pi$ is such that $(\theta, \alpha_{\theta}) \neq 0$, then α_{θ} is long and we prove that $\Pi \setminus \Pi[\alpha_{\theta}]_{min}$ consists of the simple roots that are adjacent to α_{θ} in the Dynkin diagram (Proposition 2.4).

II. We give a new characterisation of normalisers of arbitrary $\mathfrak{b}$ -stable subspaces of $\mathfrak{u}$ (Theorem 3.3) and then explicitly describe the normalisers of the globally maximal abelian ideals, i.e., we determine $\Pi[\alpha]_{max}$ for all $\alpha \in \Pi_l$ (Theorem 3.9). This is based on a relationship between $\mathfrak{a}(\alpha)_{min}$ and $\mathfrak{a}(\alpha)_{max}$ for $\alpha \in \Pi_l$ [10, Theorem 4.7], which allows us to retrieve information on $\Pi[\alpha]_{max}$ from that on $\Pi[\alpha]_{min}$.

III. In Section 4, we relate $\mathfrak{a} \in \mathfrak{Ab}(\mathfrak{g})$ to the $\mathbb{Z}$ -grading of $\mathfrak{g}$ corresponding to $\mathfrak{n}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{a})$. Let $\mathfrak{Par}(\mathfrak{g})$ denote the set of all standard parabolic subalgebras of $\mathfrak{g}$. By Peterson’s theorem [6], $\#\mathfrak{Ab}(\mathfrak{g}) = 2^{\text{rk } \mathfrak{g}}$, hence the sets $\mathfrak{Ab}(\mathfrak{g})$ and $\mathfrak{Par}(\mathfrak{g})$ are equipotent. There is the natural mapping $f_1 : \mathfrak{Ab}(\mathfrak{g}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{Par}(\mathfrak{g})$ that takes $\mathfrak{a}$ to $\mathfrak{n}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{a})$. By [12], f_1 is a bijection if and only if $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sl}_{n+1}$ or $\mathfrak{sp}_{2n}$. Using the $\mathbb{Z}$ -grading associated with $\mathfrak{p} \in \mathfrak{Par}(\mathfrak{g})$, we define here the natural mapping $f_2 : \mathfrak{Par}(\mathfrak{g}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{Ab}(\mathfrak{g})$ and prove that f_2 is a bijection if and only if $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sl}_{n+1}$ or $\mathfrak{sp}_{2n}$; furthermore, $f_2 = f_1^{-1}$ for these two series (Theorem 4.5). We say that $\mathfrak{a} \in \mathfrak{Ab}$ is *reflexive*, if $(f_2 \circ f_1)(\mathfrak{a}) = \mathfrak{a}$. Then all abelian ideals for $\mathfrak{sl}_{n+1}$ and $\mathfrak{sp}_{2n}$ are reflexive. We also prove that $\mathfrak{a}(\alpha)_{min}$ and $\mathfrak{a}(\alpha)_{max}$ ($\alpha \in \Pi_l$) are always reflexive and characterise them in terms of the corresponding $\mathbb{Z}$ -gradings (see Theorem 4.2 and Remark 4.6). Finally, we conjecture that the sets $\text{Im}(f_1 \circ f_2)$ and $\text{Im}(f_2 \circ f_1)$ are always equipotent and the maps f_1 and f_2 induce the mutually inverse bijections between them.

We refer to [1, 5] for standard results on root systems and (affine) Weyl groups.

Acknowledgements. The research was carried out at the IITP RAS at the expense of the Russian Foundation for Sciences (project № 14-50-00150).

1. PRELIMINARIES ON MINUSCULE ELEMENTS AND NORMALISERS OF ABELIAN IDEALS

We equip Δ^+ with the usual partial ordering ‘ $\preceq$ ’. This means that $\mu \preceq \nu$ if $\nu - \mu$ is a non-negative integral linear combination of simple roots. If M is a subset of Δ^+ , then $\min(M)$ and $\max(M)$ are the minimal and maximal elements of M with respect to “ $\preceq$ ”.

Any $\mathfrak{b}$ -stable subspace $\mathfrak{c} \subset \mathfrak{u}$ is a sum of certain root spaces in $\mathfrak{u}$, i.e., $\mathfrak{c} = \bigoplus_{\gamma \in I_{\mathfrak{c}}} \mathfrak{g}_{\gamma}$. The relation $[\mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{c}] \subset \mathfrak{c}$ is equivalent to that $I = I_{\mathfrak{c}}$ is an *upper ideal* of the poset $(\Delta^+, \preceq)$, i.e., if $\nu \in I$, $\gamma \in \Delta^+$, and $\nu \preceq \gamma$, then $\gamma \in I$. We mostly work in the combinatorial setting, so that a $\mathfrak{b}$ -ideal $\mathfrak{c} \subset \mathfrak{u}$ is being identified with the corresponding upper ideal I of Δ^+ . The property of being abelian additionally means that $\gamma' + \gamma'' \notin \Delta^+$ for all $\gamma', \gamma'' \in I$.

We recall below the notion of a minuscule element of $\widehat{W}$ and their relation to abelian ideals. We have $\Pi = \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\}$, the vector space $\mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{R}} = V = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \mathbb{R}\alpha_i$, the Weyl group W generated by simple reflections $s_1, \dots, s_n$, and a W -invariant inner product $(\cdot, \cdot)$ on V . Letting $\widehat{V} = V \oplus \mathbb{R}\delta \oplus \mathbb{R}\lambda$, we extend the inner product $(\cdot, \cdot)$ on $\widehat{V}$ so that $(\delta, V) = (\lambda, V) = (\delta, \delta) = (\lambda, \lambda) = 0$ and $(\delta, \lambda) = 1$. Set $\alpha_0 = \delta - \theta$, where θ is the highest root in Δ^+ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\Delta} &= \{\Delta + k\delta \mid k \in \mathbb{Z}\} \text{ is the set of affine (real) roots;} \\ \widehat{\Delta}^+ &= \Delta^+ \cup \{\Delta + k\delta \mid k \geq 1\} \text{ is the set of positive affine roots;} \\ \widehat{\Pi} &= \Pi \cup \{\alpha_0\} \text{ is the corresponding set of affine simple roots;} \\ \mu^\vee &= 2\mu/(\mu, \mu) \text{ is the coroot corresponding to } \mu \in \widehat{\Delta}. \end{aligned}$$

For each $\alpha_i \in \widehat{\Pi}$, let $s_i = s_{\alpha_i}$ denote the corresponding reflection in $GL(\widehat{V})$. That is, $s_i(x) = x - (x, \alpha_i)\alpha_i^\vee$ for any $x \in \widehat{V}$. The affine Weyl group, $\widehat{W}$, is the subgroup of $GL(\widehat{V})$ generated by the reflections $s_0, s_1, \dots, s_n$. The extended inner product $(\cdot, \cdot)$ on $\widehat{V}$ is $\widehat{W}$ -invariant. The *inversion set* of $w \in \widehat{W}$ is $\mathcal{N}(w) = \{\nu \in \widehat{\Delta}^+ \mid w(\nu) \in -\widehat{\Delta}^+\}$. Note that if $w \in W \subset \widehat{W}$, then $\mathcal{N}(w) \subset \Delta^+$.

Following Peterson, we say that $w \in \widehat{W}$ is *minuscule*, if $\mathcal{N}(w) = \{-\gamma + \delta \mid \gamma \in I_w\}$ for some $I_w \subset \Delta$. One then proves that (i) $I_w \subset \Delta^+$, (ii) I_w is (the set of roots of) an abelian ideal, and (iii) the assignment $w \mapsto I_w$ yields a bijection between the minuscule elements of $\widehat{W}$ and the abelian ideals, see [6], [2, Prop. 2.8]. Conversely, if $\mathfrak{a} \in \mathfrak{Ab}$ and $I = I_{\mathfrak{a}}$, then $w_{\mathfrak{a}} \in \widehat{W}$ stands for the corresponding minuscule element. Clearly, $\dim \mathfrak{a} = \#I_{\mathfrak{a}} = \#\mathcal{N}(w_{\mathfrak{a}})$.

Given $\mathfrak{a} \in \mathfrak{Ab}^o$ and $w_{\mathfrak{a}} \in \widehat{W}$, the *rootlet* of $\mathfrak{a}$ is defined by

$$\tau(\mathfrak{a}) = w_{\mathfrak{a}}(\alpha_0) + \delta = w_{\mathfrak{a}}(2\delta - \theta).$$

By [8, Prop. 2.5], we have $\tau(\mathfrak{a}) \in \Delta_l^+$ and every $\mu \in \Delta_l^+$ occurs in this way.

Let $\mathfrak{l}$ be the standard Levi subalgebra of $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{n}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{a})$ and $\Pi(\mathfrak{l}) \subset \Pi$ the set of simple roots of $\mathfrak{l}$. By [9, Theorem 2.8], the set $\Pi(\mathfrak{l})$ is determined by $w_{\mathfrak{a}}$ as follows:

$$\alpha \in \Pi(\mathfrak{l}) \iff w_{\mathfrak{a}}(\alpha) \in \widehat{\Pi}.$$

(Actually, this result of [9] has been proved for any $\mathfrak{b}$ -stable subspace $\mathfrak{c} \subset \mathfrak{u}$ in place of $\mathfrak{a}$. To this end, one also needs a more general theory of elements of $\widehat{W}$ associated with arbitrary $\mathfrak{b}$ -stable subspaces of $\mathfrak{u}$ [2].)

An advantage of our situation is that, for the root-minimal abelian ideals $\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{a}(\mu)_{\min}$, there is a simple formula for $w_{\mathfrak{a}}$, which allows us to describe the corresponding normaliser in terms of μ . We also need the following facts:

- $\# \tau^{-1}(\mu) = 1$ (i.e., $\mathfrak{a}(\mu)_{\min} = \mathfrak{a}(\mu)_{\max}$) if and only if $(\theta, \mu) \neq 0$ [8, Theorem 5.1].
- $\mathfrak{a}$ is root-minimal if and only if $I_{\mathfrak{a}} \subset \mathcal{H} := \{\gamma \in \Delta^+ \mid (\gamma, \theta) \neq 0\}$ [8, Theorem 4.3];

In what follows, it will be important to distinguish the cases whether θ is fundamental or not, and whether $(\theta, \mu) = 0$ or not. Recall that θ is fundamental if and only if Δ is not of type $\mathbf{A}_n$ or $\mathbf{C}_n$. One also has $\#(\Pi \cap \mathcal{H}) = \begin{cases} 2 & \text{for } \mathbf{A}_n \\ 1 & \text{for all other types} \end{cases}$. For the classical series, we use the standard notation and numbering for Π , which seems to be the same in all sources. For instance, for $\mathbf{A}_n$, we have $\alpha_i = \varepsilon_i - \varepsilon_{i+1}$ ($i = 1, \dots, n$), whence $\Pi \cap \mathcal{H} = \{\alpha_1, \alpha_n\}$. For $\mathbf{E}_6$, our numbering is $\begin{smallmatrix} 1-2-3-4-5 \\ | \\ 6 \end{smallmatrix}$; hence $\Pi \cap \mathcal{H} = \{\alpha_6\}$.

For $\gamma \in \Delta$ and $\alpha \in \Pi$, $[\gamma : \alpha]$ stands for the coefficient of α in the expression of γ via Π .

2. NORMALISERS OF THE ROOT-MINIMAL ABELIAN IDEALS

In this section, we describe normalisers of the root-minimal abelian ideals for all $\mu \in \Delta_l^+$.

There is a unique element of minimal length in W taking θ to μ [8, Theorem 4.1], which is denoted by w_μ . The ideal $\mathfrak{a}(\mu)_{\min}$ is completely determined by w_μ . Namely, $w_\mu s_0 \in \widehat{W}$ is the minuscule element corresponding to $\mathfrak{a}(\mu)_{\min}$ [8, Theorem 4.2]. We begin with two useful properties of the elements w_μ .

Lemma 2.1. *If $\beta \in \Pi$ and $(\beta, \mu) = 0$, then $w_\mu^{-1}(\beta) \in \Pi$ and $(w_\mu^{-1}(\beta), \theta) = 0$.*

Proof. It is known that $\mathcal{N}(w_\mu^{-1}) = \{\gamma \in \Delta^+ \mid (\gamma, \mu^\vee) = -1\}$ [8, Theorem 4.1(2)]. Therefore $w_\mu^{-1}(\beta) \in \Delta^+$. Assume that $w_\mu^{-1}(\beta) = \gamma_1 + \gamma_2$ is a sum of positive roots. Then $\beta = w_\mu(\gamma_1) + w_\mu(\gamma_2)$. Without loss of generality, one may assume that $-\nu_1 := w_\mu(\gamma_1)$ is negative. Then $\nu_1 \in \mathcal{N}(w_\mu^{-1})$, hence $(-\nu_1, \mu^\vee) = 1$. Consequently, $(\gamma_1, \theta^\vee) = 1$. On the other hand, $0 = (\mu, \beta) = (\theta, \gamma_1 + \gamma_2)$ and therefore $(\theta, \gamma_2) < 0$, which is impossible. Thus, $w_\mu^{-1}(\beta)$ must be simple and $(w_\mu^{-1}(\beta), \theta) = (\beta, \mu) = 0$. $\square$

Lemma 2.2. *Suppose that θ is fundamental and $\alpha_\theta \in \Pi$ is not orthogonal to θ . If $(\theta, \mu) > 0$ and $\theta \neq \mu$, then $w_\mu^{-1}(\theta) = \theta - \alpha_\theta$; or, equivalently, $w_\mu(\alpha_\theta) = \mu - \theta$.*

Proof. It is well known and easily verified that α_θ is long and $[\theta : \alpha_\theta] = 2$ (cf. also Theorem 4.1(ii)). If $\mu \in \mathcal{H} \setminus \{\theta\}$, then $[\mu : \alpha_\theta] = 1$. By [11, Section 1], multiplicities of the simple reflections in any reduced expression of w_μ are the same, and they are determined by the coefficients of $\theta - \mu$. In particular, s_{α_θ} occurs only once, since $[\theta - \mu : \alpha_\theta] = 1$ and α_θ is long. Moreover, the reduced expressions of w_μ are in a bijections with the “root paths” connecting θ with μ inside Δ_l^+ . Since θ is fundamental, the passage $\theta \rightsquigarrow s_{\alpha_\theta}(\theta)$ is the only step down from θ inside Δ_l^+ . Hence any root path leading to μ starts with this step. Therefore, every reduced expression of w_μ begins with s_{α_θ} , and one can write $w_\mu = w' s_{\alpha_\theta}$, where w' does not contain factors s_{α_θ} . Therefore, $w_\mu^{-1}(\theta) = s_{\alpha_\theta} w'^{-1}(\theta) = s_{\alpha_\theta}(\theta) = \theta - \alpha_\theta$. $\square$

Remark. This is a generalisation of [11, Lemma 4.3], where the similar assertion is proved for $\mu = \alpha_\theta$.

Recall that $\Pi[\mu]_{\min} \subset \Pi$ is the set of simple roots for the standard Levi subalgebra of $\mathfrak{p}[\mu]_{\min}$. Since θ is not fundamental if and only if $\Delta = \mathbf{A}_n$ or $\mathbf{C}_n$, the following result covers all the possibilities for μ .

Theorem 2.3. *For any $\mu \in \Delta_l^+$, the set $\Pi[\mu]_{\min}$ has the following description.*

- (i) $\Pi[\mu]_{\min} \cap \theta^\perp = \{w_\mu^{-1}(\beta) \mid \beta \in \Pi \text{ \& } (\beta, \mu) = 0\} = \{\alpha \in \Pi \mid w_\mu(\alpha) \in \Pi \text{ \& } (\alpha, \theta) = 0\}$.
- (ii) *If $(\mu, \theta) = 0$, then $\Pi[\mu]_{\min} = \{w_\mu^{-1}(\beta) \mid \beta \in \Pi \text{ \& } (\beta, \mu) = 0\}$. In particular, $\Pi[\mu]_{\min} \subset \theta^\perp$.*
- (iii) *Suppose that $(\mu, \theta) \neq 0$ (i.e., $\mu \in \mathcal{H}$) and $\mu \neq \theta$.*
 - a) *if θ is fundamental, then $\Pi[\mu]_{\min} = \{\alpha_\theta\} \cup \{w_\mu^{-1}(\beta) \mid \beta \in \Pi \text{ \& } (\beta, \mu) = 0\}$, where α_θ is the only simple root such that $(\theta, \alpha_\theta) \neq 0$;*
 - b) *if $\Delta = \mathbf{C}_n$, then there is no such long roots μ ;*
 - c) *if $\Delta = \mathbf{A}_n$ and $\mu = \alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_i = \gamma_i$ ($i < n$) or $\alpha_j + \dots + \alpha_n = \tilde{\gamma}_j$ ($j > 1$), then*
 $\Pi[\gamma_i]_{\min} = \{\alpha_n\} \cup \{w_{\gamma_i}^{-1}(\beta) \mid \beta \in \Pi \text{ \& } (\beta, \gamma_i) = 0\} = \Pi \setminus \{\alpha_1, \alpha_i\}$ *and*
 $\Pi[\tilde{\gamma}_j]_{\min} = \{\alpha_1\} \cup \{w_{\tilde{\gamma}_j}^{-1}(\beta) \mid \beta \in \Pi \text{ \& } (\beta, \tilde{\gamma}_j) = 0\} = \Pi \setminus \{\alpha_j, \alpha_n\}$.
- (iv) *If $\mu = \theta$, then $\Pi[\theta]_{\min} = \{\beta \in \Pi \mid (\beta, \theta) = 0\}$.*

Proof. Since $w_\mu s_0 \in \widehat{W}$ is the minuscule element corresponding to $I(\mu)_{\min}$, the general theory of normalisers of $\mathfrak{b}$ -stable subspaces of $\mathfrak{u}$ asserts that

$$(2.1) \quad \alpha \in \Pi[\mu]_{\min} \iff w_\mu s_0(\alpha) \in \widehat{\Pi},$$

see [9, Theorem 2.8]. Here one has to distinguish two possibilities:

- (1) $w_\mu s_0(\alpha) \in \Pi$;
 - (2) $w_\mu s_0(\alpha) = \alpha_0 = \delta - \theta$.
- Suppose that $w_\mu s_0(\alpha) = \beta \in \Pi$. Then $w_\mu^{-1}(\beta) = s_0(\alpha) \in \Delta$. Hence $s_0(\alpha) = \alpha$ and therefore $(\theta, \alpha) = 0$ and $(\beta, \mu) = (w_\mu(\alpha), w_\mu(\theta)) = 0$. Thus, if $\alpha \in \Pi[\mu]_{\min}$ satisfies (1), then $w_\mu(\alpha) = \beta \in \Pi$ and $(\beta, \mu) = (\theta, \alpha) = 0$.

Conversely, if $\beta \in \Pi$ and $(\beta, \mu) = 0$, then Lemma 2.1 shows that $\alpha := w_\mu^{-1}(\beta) \in \Pi$ and $(\alpha, \theta) = 0$. Hence (1) is satisfied for μ and α .

- Suppose that $w_\mu s_0(\alpha) = \alpha_0 = \delta - \theta$. Then $w_\mu^{-1}(\delta - \theta) = s_0(\alpha)$. Therefore, $\alpha \in \Pi_l$ and $s_0(\alpha) \neq \alpha$, i.e., $(\alpha, \theta) \neq 0$. More precisely, $\delta - w_\mu^{-1}(\theta) = \delta - (\theta - \alpha)$, hence $w_\mu^{-1}(\theta) = \theta - \alpha$. The last equality can be rewritten as $\theta = \mu - w_\mu(\alpha)$. Therefore, $(\mu, \theta) \neq 0$ and $\mu \neq \theta$. Hence equality (2) can only occur for $\mu \in \mathcal{H} \setminus \{\theta\}$ and $\alpha \in \mathcal{H}$. Furthermore, if θ is fundamental, then one must have $\alpha = \alpha_\theta$. By Lemma 2.2, the equality $w_\mu^{-1}(\theta) = \theta - \alpha_\theta$ is then satisfied and we conclude that $\alpha_\theta \in \Pi[\mu]_{\min}$.

This proves parts (i),(ii),(iiia).

Parts (iiib) is clear, and (iiic) is obtained by a direct calculation.

(iv) Here $\mathfrak{a}(\theta)_{\min} = \mathfrak{g}_\theta$, and the assertion is obvious. $\square$

Theorem 2.3 provides a complete description of $\Pi[\mu]_{\min}$ for all $\mu \in \Delta_l^+$. But for some long simple roots, the assertion can be made even more precise.

Proposition 2.4. *If θ is fundamental and $(\theta, \alpha_\theta) \neq 0$, then $\Pi[\alpha_\theta]_{\min} = \{\alpha_\theta\} \cup \{\beta \in \Pi \mid (\beta, \alpha_\theta) = 0\}$. Therefore, $\Pi \setminus \Pi[\alpha_\theta]_{\min}$ consists of the simple roots that are adjacent to α_θ in the Dynkin diagram.*

Proof. By Theorem 2.3(iii), we have $\Pi[\alpha_\theta]_{\min} = \{\alpha_\theta\} \cup \{w_{\alpha_\theta}^{-1}(\beta) \mid \beta \in \Pi \text{ \& } (\beta, \alpha_\theta) = 0\}$. Therefore, we are to prove that $w_{\alpha_\theta}^{-1}$ permutes the simple roots orthogonal to α_θ . If $\beta \in \Pi$ and $(\beta, \alpha_\theta) = 0$, then we already know that $w_{\alpha_\theta}^{-1}(\beta) \in \Pi$. Next, using Lemma 2.2 with $\mu = \alpha_\theta$, we obtain

$$(w_{\alpha_\theta}^{-1}(\beta), \alpha_\theta) = (\beta, w_{\alpha_\theta}(\alpha_\theta)) = (\beta, \alpha_\theta - \theta) = -(\beta, \theta).$$

Since $\beta \neq \alpha_\theta$ and θ is fundamental, this must be zero. $\square$

The minuscule elements for the root-maximal abelian ideals do not admit a simple formula. Therefore, we cannot explicitly describe $\mathfrak{p}[\mu]_{\max}$ for all $\mu \in \Delta^+$. However, if $\mu \in \Pi_l$, then $\mathfrak{a}(\mu)_{\min}$ is closely related to $\mathfrak{a}(\mu)_{\max}$, and such a situation is considered in the next section.

3. NORMALISERS OF SOME ROOT-MAXIMAL ABELIAN IDEALS

We begin with a new property of the normaliser of an arbitrary $\mathfrak{b}$ -stable subspace of $\mathfrak{u}$. Let $\mathfrak{c} \subset \mathfrak{u}$ be such a subspace and $I_{\mathfrak{c}}$ the corresponding set of positive roots. Being a standard parabolic subalgebra, $\mathfrak{n}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{c})$ is fully determined by the simple roots of the standard Levi subalgebra or, equivalently, by the set of simple roots α such that $\mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha} \notin \mathfrak{n}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{c})$. The following is proved in [12, Theorem 3.2].

Theorem 3.1. *For any $\mathfrak{b}$ -stable subspace $\mathfrak{c} \subset \mathfrak{u}$ and $\alpha \in \Pi$, we have*

$$\mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha} \notin \mathfrak{n}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{c}) \Leftrightarrow \exists \gamma \in \min(I_{\mathfrak{c}}) \text{ such that } \gamma - \alpha \in \Delta^+ \cup \{0\}.$$

The point of this result is that it suffices to test only the *minimal* roots of $I_{\mathfrak{c}}$. Note that if $\gamma - \alpha$ is a root, then $\gamma - \alpha \in \Delta^+ \setminus I_{\mathfrak{c}}$. Our new observation is that it is equally suitable to test only the *maximal* roots of $\Delta^+ \setminus I_{\mathfrak{c}}$. To this end, we first provide an auxiliary assertion.

Lemma 3.2. *Suppose that $\mu \in \Delta^+$ and $\alpha, \tilde{\alpha}$ are different simple roots. If $\mu + \alpha, \mu + \tilde{\alpha} \in \Delta$, then $\mu + \alpha + \tilde{\alpha} \in \Delta$.*

Proof. As $\alpha, \tilde{\alpha} \in \Pi$, we have $(\tilde{\alpha}, \alpha) \leq 0$. Furthermore, $(\mu + \alpha) - (\mu + \tilde{\alpha}) \notin \Delta$, hence

$$(\mu + \alpha, \mu + \tilde{\alpha}) = (\mu, \mu) + (\mu, \alpha) + (\mu, \tilde{\alpha}) + (\alpha, \tilde{\alpha}) \leq 0.$$

Since $(\mu, \mu) > 0$, the sum contains at least one negative summand.

- If $(\mu, \alpha) < 0$, then $(\mu + \tilde{\alpha}, \alpha) < 0$ and we are done.
- If $(\mu, \tilde{\alpha}) < 0$, then $(\mu + \alpha, \tilde{\alpha}) < 0$ and we are done.
- If $(\mu, \alpha) = (\mu, \tilde{\alpha}) = 0$, then $\mu, \alpha, \tilde{\alpha}$ are short roots. Then $(\mu + \alpha, \mu + \tilde{\alpha}) = (\mu, \mu) - (\alpha, \tilde{\alpha}) \geq (\mu, \mu) - \frac{1}{2}(\mu, \mu) > 0$, which shows that this case is impossible. $\square$

Theorem 3.3. Suppose that $\mathfrak{c} \subset \mathfrak{u}$ is $\mathfrak{b}$ -stable and $\mathfrak{c} \neq \mathfrak{u}$. For $\alpha \in \Pi$, we have

$$\mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha} \not\subset \mathfrak{n}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{c}) \Leftrightarrow \exists \gamma \in \max(\Delta^+ \setminus I_{\mathfrak{c}}) \text{ such that } \gamma + \alpha \in \Delta \text{ (and hence } \gamma + \alpha \in I_{\mathfrak{c}}).$$

Proof. The implication “ $\Leftarrow$ ” is obvious.

“ $\Rightarrow$ ”. If $\mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha} \not\subset \mathfrak{n}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{c})$, then there is $\mu \in \min(I_{\mathfrak{c}})$ such that $\mu - \alpha \in (\Delta^+ \setminus I_{\mathfrak{c}}) \cup \{0\}$.

- If $\mu - \alpha \in \max(\Delta^+ \setminus I_{\mathfrak{c}})$, then $\gamma = \mu - \alpha$, and we are done;
- If $\mu - \alpha$ is nonzero and not maximal in $\Delta^+ \setminus I_{\mathfrak{c}}$, then there is an $\tilde{\alpha} \in \Pi$ such that $\mu - \alpha + \tilde{\alpha} \in \Delta^+ \setminus I_{\mathfrak{c}}$. Applying Lemma 3.2 to $\mu - \alpha$ shows that $\mu + \tilde{\alpha}$ is a root and then automatically, $\mu + \tilde{\alpha} \in I_{\mathfrak{c}}$. Thus, the pair $\{\mu - \alpha, \mu\}$ can be replaced with the “higher” pair $\{\mu - \alpha + \tilde{\alpha}, \mu + \tilde{\alpha}\}$. Eventually, we obtain a pair whose lower root is maximal in $\Delta^+ \setminus I_{\mathfrak{c}}$.
- If $\mu = \alpha$, then $I_{\mathfrak{c}}$ contains all positive roots with nonzero coefficient of α . Since $\Delta^+ \setminus I_{\mathfrak{c}} \neq \emptyset$, there exists a $\nu \in \Delta^+ \setminus I_{\mathfrak{c}}$ such that $\nu + \alpha$ is a root, necessarily in $I_{\mathfrak{c}}$. If $\nu \notin \max(\Delta^+ \setminus I_{\mathfrak{c}})$, then we can perform the induction procedure of the previous paragraph. $\square$

In the setting of abelian ideals, there is a special case in which $\max(\Delta^+ \setminus I_{\mathfrak{c}})$ is related to the *minimal* roots of another ideal.

Proposition 3.4 ([10, Theorem 4.7]). For any $\tilde{\alpha} \in \Pi_l$, one has

$$\gamma \in \min(I(\tilde{\alpha})_{\min}) \iff \theta - \gamma \in \max(\Delta^+ \setminus I(\tilde{\alpha})_{\max}).$$

In particular, if $\text{rk } \Delta > 1$ (i.e., $I(\tilde{\alpha})_{\min} \neq \{\theta\}$), then $\max(\Delta^+ \setminus I(\tilde{\alpha})_{\max}) \subset \mathcal{H} \setminus \{\theta\}$.

In the rest of this section, we only consider the abelian ideals with rootlet $\tilde{\alpha} \in \Pi_l$. Using Theorem 3.3 and Proposition 3.4, we are going to compare the normalisers $\mathfrak{p}[\tilde{\alpha}]_{\max} = \mathfrak{n}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{a}(\tilde{\alpha})_{\max})$ and $\mathfrak{p}[\tilde{\alpha}]_{\min} = \mathfrak{n}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{a}(\tilde{\alpha})_{\min})$. We write $\mathcal{S}[\tilde{\alpha}]_{\max}$ and $\mathcal{S}[\tilde{\alpha}]_{\min}$, respectively, for the simple roots that do **not** belong to their standard Levi subalgebras. In other words, $\mathcal{S}[\tilde{\alpha}]_{\min} := \Pi \setminus \Pi[\tilde{\alpha}]_{\min}$, and likewise for ‘max’.

Theorem 3.5. For any $\tilde{\alpha} \in \Pi$, we have $\mathcal{S}[\tilde{\alpha}]_{\max} \subset \mathcal{S}[\tilde{\alpha}]_{\min}$ and thereby $\mathfrak{p}[\tilde{\alpha}]_{\max} \supset \mathfrak{p}[\tilde{\alpha}]_{\min}$.

Proof. If $\mathfrak{g} \neq \mathfrak{sl}_2$, then $[u, u] \neq 0$. Hence $\mathfrak{a}(\tilde{\alpha})_{max} \neq u$, i.e., $I(\tilde{\alpha})_{max} \neq \Delta^+$. Therefore, $\alpha \in \mathcal{S}[\tilde{\alpha}]_{max}$ if and only if there exists $\gamma \in \max(\Delta^+ \setminus I(\tilde{\alpha})_{max})$ such that $\gamma + \alpha \in I(\tilde{\alpha})_{max}$ (Theorem 3.3). Then $\gamma \in \mathcal{H} \setminus \{\theta\}$ (Proposition 3.4) and hence $\gamma + \alpha \in \mathcal{H} \cap I(\tilde{\alpha})_{max} = I(\tilde{\alpha})_{min}$ [10, Proposition 3.2]. By Proposition 3.4, we have $\nu := \theta - \gamma \in \min(I(\tilde{\alpha})_{min})$ and $\nu - \alpha = \theta - (\gamma + \alpha)$ is either a root or zero. In both cases, applying Theorem 3.1 to ν , we conclude that $\alpha \in \mathcal{S}[\tilde{\alpha}]_{min}$. $\square$

Actually, there is a more precise statement.

Theorem 3.6. *Excluding the case in which Δ is of type $\mathbf{A}_n$ with $\tilde{\alpha} = \alpha_1$ or α_n , we have $\mathcal{S}[\tilde{\alpha}]_{max} = \mathcal{S}[\tilde{\alpha}]_{min} \cap \theta^\perp$.*

Proof. 1. Suppose that $\alpha \in \mathcal{S}[\tilde{\alpha}]_{max}$ and $\gamma \in \max(\Delta^+ \setminus I(\tilde{\alpha})_{max})$ is such that $\gamma + \alpha \in I(\tilde{\alpha})_{max}$. As explained in the previous proof, we then have $\nu = \theta - \gamma \in \min(I(\tilde{\alpha})_{min}) \subset \mathcal{H}$ and $\nu - \alpha \in \Delta^+ \cup \{0\}$. Consider these two possibilities for $\nu - \alpha$.

(i) $\nu = \alpha$. Then $\alpha \in I(\tilde{\alpha})_{min}$, which is only possible if $\tilde{\alpha} = \alpha$, since $I(\tilde{\alpha})_{min} \subset \{\mu \in \Delta^+ \mid \mu \succcurlyeq \tilde{\alpha}\}$ [10, Proposition 3.4]. Therefore $\tilde{\alpha} = \alpha$, $\tilde{\alpha} \in \mathcal{H}$, and $[\theta : \tilde{\alpha}] = 1$. All this only occurs for Δ of type $\mathbf{A}_n$ with $\tilde{\alpha} = \alpha_1$ or α_n .

(ii) $\nu - \alpha \in \Delta^+$. Then $\nu - \alpha \in \mathcal{H}$, since $(\nu - \alpha) + (\gamma + \alpha) = \theta$. That is both ν and $\nu - \alpha$ belong to $\mathcal{H} \setminus \{\theta\}$. Hence $(\theta, \alpha) = 0$.

2. Conversely, assume that $\alpha \in \mathcal{S}[\tilde{\alpha}]_{min} \cap \theta^\perp$. That is, $(\theta, \alpha) = 0$ and for some $\nu \in \min(I(\tilde{\alpha})_{min})$, we have $\nu - \alpha \in \Delta^+ \cup \{0\}$.

For $\nu = \alpha$, we argue as in part 1(i). If $\nu - \alpha \in \Delta^+$, then both $\gamma = \theta - \nu$ and $\gamma + \alpha$ are roots, and $\gamma \in \max(\Delta^+ \setminus I(\tilde{\alpha})_{max})$ in view of Proposition 3.4. Hence $\alpha \in \mathcal{S}[\tilde{\alpha}]_{max}$. $\square$

Remark 3.7. Recall that $\mathfrak{a}(\tilde{\alpha})_{min} = \mathfrak{a}(\tilde{\alpha})_{max}$ if and only if $(\tilde{\alpha}, \theta) \neq 0$, i.e., $\tilde{\alpha} \in \mathcal{H}$ [8, Theorem 5.1(i)]. If this is the case (and $\Delta \neq \mathbf{A}_n$), then Theorem 3.6 implies that $\mathcal{S}[\tilde{\alpha}]_{max} = \mathcal{S}[\tilde{\alpha}]_{min} \subset \theta^\perp$. In the distinguished case of $(\mathbf{A}_n, \alpha_1 \text{ or } \alpha_n)$, we have $\mathfrak{a}(\alpha_1)_{min} = \mathfrak{a}(\alpha_1)_{max}$ and $\mathcal{S}[\alpha_1]_{min} = \{\alpha_1\}$, whereas $\Pi \cap \mathcal{H} = \{\alpha_1, \alpha_n\}$.

Corollary 3.8. *If $I(\tilde{\alpha})_{min} \neq I(\tilde{\alpha})_{max}$, then $\mathfrak{p}[\tilde{\alpha}]_{min} \neq \mathfrak{p}[\tilde{\alpha}]_{max}$.*

Proof. Since $I(\tilde{\alpha})_{min} \neq I(\tilde{\alpha})_{max}$, we have $(\tilde{\alpha}, \theta) = 0$. Then $\Pi[\tilde{\alpha}]_{min} \subset \theta^\perp$ by Theorem 2.3(ii). Then $\mathcal{S}[\tilde{\alpha}]_{min} \supset \Pi \cap \mathcal{H}$, and $\mathcal{S}[\tilde{\alpha}]_{max} \cap \mathcal{H} = \emptyset$ in view of Theorem 3.6. That is, $\mathcal{S}[\tilde{\alpha}]_{min} \neq \mathcal{S}[\tilde{\alpha}]_{max}$. $\square$

Combining Theorems 2.3 and 3.6 yields a complete description of the normaliser for the maximal abelian ideals $\mathfrak{a}(\tilde{\alpha})_{max}$, which turns out to be more uniform than that for $\mathfrak{a}(\tilde{\alpha})_{min}$. In the rest of the section, we write $\tilde{w}$ in place of $w_{\tilde{\alpha}}$.

Theorem 3.9. (i) *Excluding the case in which Δ is of type $\mathbf{A}_n$ with $\tilde{\alpha} = \alpha_1$ or α_n , we have*

$$\Pi[\tilde{\alpha}]_{max} = (\Pi \cap \mathcal{H}) \bigsqcup \{\tilde{w}^{-1}(\beta) \mid \beta \in \Pi \text{ \& } (\beta, \tilde{\alpha}) = 0\}.$$

(ii) In particular, if $(\theta, \tilde{\alpha}) = 0$, then $\Pi[\tilde{\alpha}]_{max} = (\Pi \cap \mathcal{H}) \sqcup \Pi[\tilde{\alpha}]_{min}$;

(iii) In particular, if θ is fundamental and $(\theta, \tilde{\alpha}) \neq 0$, then

$$\Pi[\tilde{\alpha}]_{max} = \Pi[\tilde{\alpha}]_{min} = \{\tilde{\alpha}\} \sqcup \{\beta \in \Pi \mid (\beta, \tilde{\alpha}) = 0\}.$$

Let us say that $\beta \in \Pi$ is *admissible* (for $\tilde{\alpha}$) if $(\beta, \tilde{\alpha}) = 0$. It follows from Theorem 2.3 that an admissible root always gives rise to a simple root of the Levi subalgebra of $\mathfrak{p}[\tilde{\alpha}]_{min}$. Furthermore, if θ is fundamental and $(\tilde{\alpha}, \theta) \neq 0$, then $\tilde{\alpha}$ also belongs to $\Pi[\tilde{\alpha}]_{min}$.

Example 3.10. (1) $\Delta = \mathbf{A}_n$, $\tilde{\alpha} = \alpha_2$. Here $\tilde{w} = s_1 s_3 \dots s_n$ and the admissible roots are $\alpha_4, \dots, \alpha_n$. One has $\tilde{w}^{-1}(\alpha_i) = \alpha_{i-1}$ for them. Hence $\Pi[\alpha_2]_{min} = \{\alpha_3, \alpha_4, \dots, \alpha_{n-1}\}$ and $\mathcal{S}[\alpha_2]_{min} = \{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_n\}$. Then $\mathcal{S}[\alpha_2]_{max} = \{\alpha_2\}$.

More generally, for $\tilde{\alpha} = \alpha_i$ ($2 \leq i \leq n-1$), one obtains $\mathcal{S}[\alpha_i]_{min} = \{\alpha_1, \alpha_i, \alpha_n\}$ and $\mathcal{S}[\alpha_i]_{max} = \{\alpha_i\}$.

(2a) $\Delta = \mathbf{D}_4$, $\tilde{\alpha} = \alpha_1$. Here $\tilde{w} = s_2 s_3 s_4 s_2$ and the admissible roots are α_3, α_4 . One has $\tilde{w}^{-1}(\alpha_3) = \alpha_4$ and $\tilde{w}^{-1}(\alpha_4) = \alpha_3$. Hence $\mathcal{S}[\alpha_1]_{min} = \{\alpha_1, \alpha_2\}$ and $\mathcal{S}[\alpha_1]_{max} = \{\alpha_1\}$.

(2b) $\Delta = \mathbf{D}_4$, $\tilde{\alpha} = \alpha_2$. There is no admissible roots here, hence $\tilde{w}$ is not really needed. Since $(\alpha_2, \theta) \neq 0$, we have $\mathcal{S}[\alpha_2]_{min} = \mathcal{S}[\alpha_2]_{max} = \{\alpha_1, \alpha_3, \alpha_4\} = \Pi \setminus (\Pi \cap \mathcal{H})$.

(3) $\Delta = \mathbf{C}_n$, $\tilde{\alpha} = \alpha_n$ (the only long simple root). Here $\tilde{w} = s_{n-1} \dots s_2 s_1$ and the admissible roots are $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{n-2}$. One has $\tilde{w}^{-1}(\alpha_i) = \alpha_{i+1}$ for them. Hence $\Pi[\alpha_n]_{min} = \{\alpha_2, \alpha_3, \dots, \alpha_{n-1}\}$ and $\mathcal{S}[\alpha_n]_{min} = \{\alpha_1, \alpha_n\}$. Then $\mathcal{S}[\alpha_n]_{max} = \{\alpha_n\}$.

(4a) $\Delta = \mathbf{E}_6$, $\tilde{\alpha} = \alpha_3$. Here $\tilde{w} = s_6 s_4 s_2 s_5 s_3 s_1 s_2 s_4 s_3 s_6$ and the admissible roots are α_1, α_5 . One has $\tilde{w}^{-1}(\alpha_1) = \alpha_4$ and $\tilde{w}^{-1}(\alpha_5) = \alpha_2$. Hence $\mathcal{S}[\alpha_3]_{min} = \{\alpha_1, \alpha_3, \alpha_5, \alpha_6\}$ and $\mathcal{S}[\alpha_3]_{max} = \{\alpha_1, \alpha_3, \alpha_5\}$.

(4b) $\Delta = \mathbf{E}_6$, $\tilde{\alpha} = \alpha_2$. Here $\tilde{w} = s_3 s_6 s_4 s_5 s_3 s_1 s_2 s_4 s_3 s_6$ and the admissible roots are $\alpha_4, \alpha_5, \alpha_6$. One has $\tilde{w}^{-1}(\alpha_4) = \alpha_3$, $\tilde{w}^{-1}(\alpha_5) = \alpha_2$ and $\tilde{w}^{-1}(\alpha_6) = \alpha_5$. Hence $\mathcal{S}[\alpha_2]_{min} = \{\alpha_1, \alpha_4, \alpha_6\}$ and $\mathcal{S}[\alpha_2]_{max} = \{\alpha_1, \alpha_4\}$.

4. NORMALISERS OF ABELIAN IDEALS AND $\mathbb{Z}$ -GRADINGS

In this section, we elaborate on a relationship between the abelian ideals, their normalisers and the associated $\mathbb{Z}$ -gradings. Any subset $S \subset \Pi$ gives rise to a $\mathbb{Z}$ -grading of $\mathfrak{g}$. Set

$$\deg(\alpha) = \begin{cases} 0, & \alpha \in \Pi \setminus S \\ 1, & \alpha \in S \end{cases}, \text{ and extend it to the whole of } \Delta \text{ by linearity. Then the } \mathbb{Z}\text{-grading}$$

$\mathfrak{g} = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathfrak{g}(i)$ is defined by the requirement that $\mathfrak{t} \subset \mathfrak{g}(0)$ and $\mathfrak{g}_\gamma \subset \mathfrak{g}(\deg(\gamma))$ for any $\gamma \in \Delta$. Set $\mathfrak{g}(\geq j) = \bigoplus_{i \geq j} \mathfrak{g}(i)$. If we wish to make the dependance on S explicit, then we write $\mathfrak{g}(i; S)$ and $\mathfrak{g}(\geq j; S)$.

Let $\mathfrak{p}$ be a standard parabolic subalgebra, $\mathfrak{l}$ the standard Levi subalgebra of $\mathfrak{p}$, and $\Pi(\mathfrak{l})$ the set of simple roots of $\mathfrak{l}$. Then $S = S(\mathfrak{p}) = \Pi \setminus \Pi(\mathfrak{l})$ determines the $\mathbb{Z}$ -grading associated

with $\mathfrak{p}$, and we also write $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{p}(S)$. In this case, $\mathfrak{g}(0; S) = \mathfrak{l}$, $\mathfrak{g}(\geq 0; S) = \mathfrak{p}$, and $\mathfrak{g}(\geq 1; S)$ is the nilradical of $\mathfrak{p}$.

The *height* of a $\mathbb{Z}$ -grading is the maximal i such that $\mathfrak{g}(i) \neq \{0\}$. For $S = \Pi \setminus \Pi(\mathfrak{l})$, we also say that it is the *height of $\mathfrak{p}(S)$* , denoted $\text{ht}(\mathfrak{p}(S))$. It is easily seen that $\text{ht}(\mathfrak{p}(S)) = \deg(\theta) = \sum_{\alpha \in S} [\theta : \alpha]$. Clearly, if $j \geq [\text{ht}(\mathfrak{p})/2] + 1$, then $\mathfrak{g}(\geq j)$ is an abelian ideal of $\mathfrak{b}$.

Convention. If $(\theta, \tilde{\alpha}) \neq 0$, then $I(\tilde{\alpha})_{\min} = I(\tilde{\alpha})_{\max}$. In this case, we omit the subscripts ‘min’ and ‘max’ from the notation for all relevant objects; that is, we merely write $\mathfrak{p}[\tilde{\alpha}]$, $\mathcal{S}[\tilde{\alpha}]$, etc.

Theorem 4.1. *Suppose that θ is fundamental, with the corresponding $\alpha_\theta \in \Pi$.*

- (i) $\mathcal{S}[\alpha_\theta] = \{\beta \in \Pi \setminus \{\alpha_\theta\} \mid (\beta, \alpha_\theta) \neq 0\}$, the set of all simple roots adjacent to α_θ ;
- (ii) α_θ is long, $[\theta : \alpha_\theta] = 2$, and $\text{ht}(\mathfrak{p}[\alpha_\theta]) = 3$;
- (iii) $\mathfrak{a}(\alpha_\theta) = \mathfrak{g}(\geq 2; \mathcal{S}[\alpha_\theta])$.

Proof. (i) It is already proved in Proposition 2.4.

(ii) If θ is fundamental, then $(\theta, \alpha_\theta^\vee) = 1 = (\alpha_\theta, \theta^\vee)$. Hence α_θ is necessarily long. Furthermore,

$$(\theta, \theta) = (\theta, \sum_{\alpha \in \Pi} [\theta : \alpha] \alpha) = [\theta : \alpha_\theta] (\theta, \alpha_\theta) = \frac{1}{2} [\theta : \alpha_\theta] (\theta, \theta).$$

Hence $[\theta : \alpha_\theta] = 2$. Finally,

$$1 = (\theta, \alpha_\theta^\vee) = 2[\theta : \alpha_\theta] - \sum_{\beta \text{ adjacent}} [\theta : \beta],$$

where the sum ranges over the simple roots β adjacent to α_θ in the Dynkin diagram. Therefore, $3 = \sum_{\beta \text{ adjacent}} [\theta : \beta] = \text{ht}(\mathfrak{p}[\alpha_\theta])$.

(iii) A general description of the minimal roots for all root-minimal ideals $\mathfrak{a}(\mu)_{\min}$ is provided in [8, Prop. 4.6]. In the situation with $\mu = \alpha_\theta$, this yields

$$\min(I(\alpha_\theta)) = \{w_{\alpha_\theta}^{-1}(\alpha_\theta + \beta_i) \mid \beta_i \in \Pi \text{ \& } \beta_i \text{ is adjacent to } \alpha_\theta\}.$$

Set $\nu_i = w_{\alpha_\theta}^{-1}(\alpha_\theta + \beta_i) = \theta + w_{\alpha_\theta}^{-1}(\beta_i)$ and write $\nu_i = m\alpha_\theta + \sum_j m_j \beta_j + (\text{others})$. Then $m = 1$, since $m = (\nu_i, \theta^\vee) = (\theta + w_{\alpha_\theta}^{-1}(\beta_i), \theta^\vee) = 2 - 1 = 1$. Next, using Lemma 2.2 with $\mu = \alpha_\theta$, we obtain

$$(\nu_i, \alpha_\theta^\vee) = (\theta + w_{\alpha_\theta}^{-1}(\beta_i), \alpha_\theta^\vee) = 1 + (\beta_i, \alpha_\theta^\vee - \theta^\vee) = 1 - 1 = 0.$$

On the other hand,

$$(\nu_i, \alpha_\theta^\vee) = 2m - \sum_j m_j.$$

Therefore, $\sum_j m_j = 2$ and all minimal roots belong to $\mathfrak{g}(2; \mathcal{S}[\alpha_\theta])$. Since $\mathfrak{g}(\geq 2; \mathcal{S}[\alpha_\theta])$ is an abelian ideal and $\mathfrak{a}(\alpha_\theta)$ is maximal abelian, we must have $\mathfrak{g}(\geq 2; \mathcal{S}[\alpha_\theta]) = \mathfrak{a}(\alpha_\theta)$. $\square$

Theorem 4.1 is a particular case of the following general assertion.

Theorem 4.2.

- (i) For any $\tilde{\alpha} \in \Pi_l$ and $n_{\tilde{\alpha}} := [\theta : \tilde{\alpha}]$, we have $\text{ht}(\mathfrak{p}[\tilde{\alpha}]_{\max}) = 2n_{\tilde{\alpha}} - 1$ and $\mathfrak{a}(\tilde{\alpha})_{\max} = \mathfrak{g}(\geq n_{\tilde{\alpha}}; \mathcal{S}[\tilde{\alpha}]_{\max})$.
- (ii) If $(\tilde{\alpha}, \theta) = 0$ (and hence $\mathcal{S}[\tilde{\alpha}]_{\max} \neq \mathcal{S}[\tilde{\alpha}]_{\min}$), then $\text{ht}(\mathfrak{p}[\tilde{\alpha}]_{\min}) = 2n_{\tilde{\alpha}} + 1$ and $\mathfrak{a}(\tilde{\alpha})_{\min} = \mathfrak{g}(\geq n_{\tilde{\alpha}} + 1; \mathcal{S}[\tilde{\alpha}]_{\min})$.

Proof. Our proof for both parts consists of a case-by-case verification. Using explicit information on $\min(I(\tilde{\alpha})_{\min})$ and $\min(I(\tilde{\alpha})_{\max})$ or results of Section 3, we explicitly determine $\mathcal{S}[\tilde{\alpha}]_{\min}$ and $\mathcal{S}[\tilde{\alpha}]_{\max}$. This yields the associated $\mathbb{Z}$ -gradings and height of all parabolics involved. The minimal roots of $I(\tilde{\alpha})_{\min}$ can be determined with the help of [8, Prop. 4.6], whereas the minimal roots of $I(\tilde{\alpha})_{\max}$ ("generators") are indicated in [12, Tables I, II]. Then one verifies that the sets $\min(I(\tilde{\alpha})_{\min})$ and $\min(I(\tilde{\alpha})_{\max})$ always coincide with the set of minimal roots of $\mathfrak{g}(\geq n_{\tilde{\alpha}} + 1; \mathcal{S}[\tilde{\alpha}]_{\min})$ and $\mathfrak{g}(\geq n_{\tilde{\alpha}}; \mathcal{S}[\tilde{\alpha}]_{\max})$, respectively. $\square$

Remark 4.3. We can directly explain the following outcome of Theorem 4.2:

$$\text{If } (\tilde{\alpha}, \theta) = 0, \text{ then } \text{ht}(\mathfrak{p}[\tilde{\alpha}]_{\min}) = \text{ht}(\mathfrak{p}[\tilde{\alpha}]_{\max}) + 2.$$

For, by Theorem 3.9(ii), we know that $\mathcal{S}[\tilde{\alpha}]_{\min} = (\Pi \cap \mathcal{H}) \cup \mathcal{S}[\tilde{\alpha}]_{\max}$. Hence

$$\text{ht}(\mathfrak{p}[\tilde{\alpha}]_{\min}) - \text{ht}(\mathfrak{p}[\tilde{\alpha}]_{\max}) = \sum_{\beta \in \Pi \cap \mathcal{H}} n_{\beta}.$$

If θ is fundamental, then $\Pi \cap \mathcal{H} = \{\alpha_{\theta}\}$ and $n_{\alpha_{\theta}} = 2$ (Theorem 4.1(ii)). For $\mathbf{A}_n$, we have $\Pi \cap \mathcal{H} = \{\alpha_1, \alpha_n\}$ and $n_{\alpha_1} + n_{\alpha_n} = 2$. This does not apply to $\mathbf{C}_n$, where $(\tilde{\alpha}, \theta) \neq 0$ for the unique long simple root $\tilde{\alpha}$.

Example 4.4. If $n_{\tilde{\alpha}} = 1$, then $I(\tilde{\alpha})_{\max} = \{\gamma \in \Delta^+ \mid [\gamma : \tilde{\alpha}] = 1\}$ and $\mathfrak{p}[\tilde{\alpha}]_{\max}$ is the maximal parabolic subalgebra with $\mathcal{S}[\tilde{\alpha}]_{\max} = \{\tilde{\alpha}\}$. Here $\text{ht}(\mathfrak{p}[\tilde{\alpha}]_{\max}) = 1$. Hence Theorem 4.2(i) is satisfied here. Furthermore, if θ is fundamental and $(\theta, \alpha_{\theta}) \neq 0$, then $\tilde{\alpha} \neq \alpha_{\theta}$ (because $n_{\alpha_{\theta}} = 2$), $(\theta, \tilde{\alpha}) = 0$, and $\mathcal{S}[\tilde{\alpha}]_{\min} = \{\tilde{\alpha}, \alpha_{\theta}\}$, see Theorem 3.9(ii). Therefore $\text{ht}(\mathfrak{p}[\tilde{\alpha}]_{\min}) = 3$, and I can prove *a priori* that $\mathfrak{a}(\tilde{\alpha})_{\min} = \mathfrak{g}(\geq 2; \{\tilde{\alpha}, \alpha_{\theta}\})$. (As this is not a decisive step, the proof is omitted.)

That is, in principle, there is a better proof of Theorem 4.2 if $n_{\tilde{\alpha}} = 1$ or $\tilde{\alpha} = \alpha_{\theta}$.

Now, we consider arbitrary abelian ideals of $\mathfrak{b}$. Let $\mathfrak{Par}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{b}) = \mathfrak{Par}(\mathfrak{g})$ be the set of all standard parabolic subalgebras of $\mathfrak{g}$. If $\mathfrak{a} \in \mathfrak{Ab}(\mathfrak{g})$, then $\mathfrak{n}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{a}) \in \mathfrak{Par}(\mathfrak{g})$. It is proved in [12] that the assignment $\mathfrak{a} \mapsto f_1(\mathfrak{a}) = \mathfrak{n}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{a})$ sets up a bijection $\mathfrak{Ab}(\mathfrak{g}) \xrightarrow{f_1} \mathfrak{Par}(\mathfrak{g})$ if and only if Δ is of type $\mathbf{A}_n$ or $\mathbf{C}_n$ (i.e., θ is not fundamental).

Here we extend that observation by looking at a natural mapping in the opposite direction. For $\mathfrak{p} \in \mathfrak{Par}(\mathfrak{g})$ and the associated $\mathbb{Z}$ -grading, we set

$$f_2(\mathfrak{p}) = \mathfrak{g}(\geq [\text{ht}(\mathfrak{p})/2] + 1) \in \mathfrak{Ab}(\mathfrak{g}).$$

This mapping occurs implicitly in Theorem 4.2, where $\text{ht}(\mathfrak{p})$ appears to be always odd.

Theorem 4.5.

- (i) If Δ is of type $\mathbf{A}_n$ or $\mathbf{C}_n$, then $f_2 : \mathfrak{Par}(\mathfrak{g}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{Ab}(\mathfrak{g})$ is a bijection. Moreover, $f_2 = f_1^{-1}$;
- (ii) If θ is fundamental, then f_2 is **not** a bijection. In fact, there is a uniform construction of two different $\mathfrak{p}_1, \mathfrak{p}_2 \in \mathfrak{Par}(\mathfrak{g})$ such that $f_2(\mathfrak{p}_1) = f_2(\mathfrak{p}_2)$.

Proof. (i) First, we recall the (slightly modified) construction of the bijection f_1 for $\mathbf{A}_n$. For $\mathfrak{a} \in \mathfrak{Ab}(\mathfrak{sl}_{n+1})$, let $\min(I_{\mathfrak{a}}) = \{\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_k\}$ with $\gamma_t = \alpha_{i_t} + \alpha_{i_t+1} + \dots + \alpha_{j_t}$, where $i_t \leq j_t$. Assuming that $i_1 \leq i_2 \leq \dots \leq i_k$, we actually obtain the restrictions

$$1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_k \leq j_1 < \dots < j_k \leq n$$

and thereby the bijection between $\mathfrak{Ab}(\mathfrak{sl}_{n+1})$ and the subsets of $[n] = \{1, \dots, n\}$. Here one obtains a subset of odd (resp. even) cardinality if $i_k = j_1$ (resp. $i_k < j_1$). Moreover, if $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{n}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{a})$, then it follows from Theorem 3.1 that $S = S(\mathfrak{p}) = \{\alpha_{i_1}, \alpha_{i_2}, \dots, \alpha_{i_k}, \alpha_{j_1}, \dots, \alpha_{j_k}\}$, modulo the possible coincidence of i_k and j_1 .

Suppose that $\mathfrak{p} \in \mathfrak{Par}(\mathfrak{sl}_{n+1})$ and $\#S$ is odd, $S \sim \{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{2k-1}\} \subset [n]$, with $t_1 < \dots < t_{2k-1}$. Then $\text{ht}(\mathfrak{p}) = 2k - 1$ and the minimal roots of $\mathfrak{g}(\geq k; S)$ are in a bijection with the shortest intervals of $[n]$ that contain k elements of S . Therefore, these minimal roots are

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_1 &= \alpha_{t_1} + \alpha_{t_2} + \dots + \alpha_{t_k}, & \gamma_2 &= \alpha_{t_2} + \alpha_{t_3} + \dots + \alpha_{t_{k+1}}, \\ &\dots, & \gamma_k &= \alpha_{t_k} + \alpha_{t_{k+1}} + \dots + \alpha_{t_{2k-1}}, \end{aligned}$$


and it is immediate that, for the abelian ideal $\mathfrak{a} = f_2(\mathfrak{p})$ generated by $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_k$, we have $f_1(\mathfrak{a}) = \mathfrak{p}$.

If $\#S$ is even, $S \sim \{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{2k}\} \subset [n]$, then $\text{ht}(\mathfrak{p}) = 2k$ and the minimal roots of $\mathfrak{g}(\geq k + 1; S)$ are

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_1 &= \alpha_{t_1} + \alpha_{t_2} + \dots + \alpha_{t_{k+1}}, & \gamma_2 &= \alpha_{t_2} + \alpha_{t_3} + \dots + \alpha_{t_{k+2}}, \\ &\dots, & \gamma_k &= \alpha_{t_k} + \alpha_{t_{k+1}} + \dots + \alpha_{t_{2k}}. \end{aligned}$$

Here again one obtains $\mathfrak{a} = f_2(\mathfrak{p})$ such that $f_1(\mathfrak{a}) = \mathfrak{p}$.

We omit the part related to $\mathbf{C}_n$, since it goes along the same lines, using the explicit description of f_1 given in [12, Theorem 3.3]. The point is that the unfolding $\mathbf{C}_n \rightsquigarrow \mathbf{A}_{2n-1}$ (see picture below) yields the identification of $\mathfrak{Ab}(\mathfrak{sp}_{2n})$ and $\mathfrak{Par}(\mathfrak{sp}_{2n})$ with the symmetric (with respect to the middle) subsets of $[2n - 1]$, and one can use a symmetrised version of the previous argument.



- (ii) Our goal is to produce two different subsets $S_1, S_2 \subset \Pi$ such that $\mathfrak{p}(S_1)$ and $\mathfrak{p}(S_2)$ give rise to the same abelian ideal. Below we use Theorem 4.1 and its proof.

As usual, α_θ is the only simple root that is not orthogonal to θ . Let S_1 be the set of all simple roots adjacent to α_θ and $S_2 = S_1 \cup \{\alpha_\theta\}$. Then $\mathfrak{p}(S_1) = \mathfrak{p}[\alpha_\theta]$, $\text{ht}(\mathfrak{p}[\alpha_\theta]) = 3$, and $\mathfrak{a}(\alpha_\theta) = \mathfrak{g}(\geq 2; S_1)$. Since $n_{\alpha_\theta} = 2$, we have $\text{ht}(\mathfrak{p}(S_2)) = 2 + \text{ht}(\mathfrak{p}[\alpha_\theta]) = 5$ and $\mathfrak{g}(\geq 3; S_2)$ is an abelian ideal. The proof of Theorem 4.1 shows that if $\nu_i \in \min(I(\alpha_\theta))$, then $[\nu_i : \alpha_\theta] = 1$ and $\sum_{\beta \in S_1} [\nu : \beta] = 2$. Hence $\mathfrak{g}_{\nu_i} \in \mathfrak{g}(3; S_2)$ and $\mathfrak{a}(\alpha_\theta) \subset \mathfrak{g}(\geq 3; S_2)$. As $\mathfrak{a}(\alpha_\theta)$ is maximal abelian, one has the equality and therefore $f_2(\mathfrak{p}(S_1)) = f_2(\mathfrak{p}(S_2))$. $\square$

Remark 4.6 (Some speculations). Set $\mathcal{F} = f_1 \circ f_2$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{F}} = f_2 \circ f_1$. We say that $\mathfrak{a} \in \mathfrak{Ab}(\mathfrak{g})$ is *reflexive*, if $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}(\mathfrak{a}) = \mathfrak{a}$; likewise, $\mathfrak{p} \in \mathfrak{Par}(\mathfrak{g})$ is *reflexive*, if $\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{p}) = \mathfrak{p}$. It is easily seen that $\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{p}) \supset \mathfrak{p}$ for all $\mathfrak{p}$, while it can happen that $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}(\mathfrak{a}) \not\supset \mathfrak{a}$ for some $\mathfrak{a}$ (e.g. if $\mathfrak{g} = \mathbf{E}_6$).

For $\mathfrak{sl}_{n+1}$ and $\mathfrak{sp}_{2n}$, all abelian ideals are reflexive, whereas this is certainly not the case for the other simple types. However, Theorem 4.2 implies that the ideals $\mathfrak{a}(\tilde{\alpha})_{\min}$ and $\mathfrak{a}(\tilde{\alpha})_{\max}$ ($\tilde{\alpha} \in \Pi_l$) are always reflexive. It might be interesting to explicitly determine all reflexive abelian ideals.

Our calculations with $\mathfrak{g}$ up to rank 4 suggest that it also might be true that (the restrictions of) f_1 and f_2 induce the mutually inverse bijections between $\text{Im}(\tilde{\mathcal{F}}) \subset \mathfrak{Ab}(\mathfrak{g})$ and $\text{Im}(\mathcal{F}) \subset \mathfrak{Par}(\mathfrak{g})$; in particular, $\#\text{Im}(\mathcal{F}) = \#\text{Im}(\tilde{\mathcal{F}})$. But the equality $\#\text{Im}(f_1) = \#\text{Im}(f_2)$ is false in general (e.g. for $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{so}_9$).

We also conjecture that $\text{Im}(\mathcal{F}) = \{\mathfrak{p} \mid \mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{p}) = \mathfrak{p}\}$ and $\text{Im}(\tilde{\mathcal{F}}) = \{\mathfrak{a} \mid \tilde{\mathcal{F}}(\mathfrak{a}) = \mathfrak{a}\}$; in other words, $\mathcal{F}^2 = \mathcal{F}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^2 = \tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ in the rings of endomorphisms of the finite sets $\mathfrak{Par}(\mathfrak{g})$ and $\mathfrak{Ab}(\mathfrak{g})$, respectively.

REFERENCES

- [1] N. BOURBAKI. “Groupes et algèbres de Lie”, Chapitres 4,5 et 6, Paris: Hermann 1975.
- [2] P. CELLINI and P. PAPI. ad-nilpotent ideals of a Borel subalgebra, *J. Algebra*, **225** (2000), 130–141.
- [3] P. CELLINI and P. PAPI. ad-nilpotent ideals of a Borel subalgebra II, *J. Algebra*, **258** (2002), 112–121.
- [4] P. CELLINI and P. PAPI. Abelian ideals of Borel subalgebras and affine Weyl groups, *Adv. Math.*, **187** (2004), 320–361.
- [5] J.E. HUMPHREYS. “Reflection Groups and Coxeter Groups”, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1992.
- [6] B. KOSTANT. The set of abelian ideals of a Borel subalgebra, Cartan decompositions, and discrete series representations, *Intern. Math. Res. Notices*, (1998), no. 5, 225–252.
- [7] B. KOSTANT. Powers of the Euler product and commutative subalgebras of a complex simple Lie algebra, *Invent. Math.*, **158** (2004), no. 1, 181–226.
- [8] D. PANYUSHEV. Abelian ideals of a Borel subalgebra and long positive roots, *Intern. Math. Res. Notices*, (2003), no. 35, 1889–1913.
- [9] D. PANYUSHEV. Normalizers of ad-nilpotent ideals, *Europ. J. Combin.*, **27** (2006), 153–178.
- [10] D. PANYUSHEV. Abelian ideals of a Borel subalgebra and root systems, *J. Eur. Math. Soc.*, **16**, no. 12 (2014), 2693–2708.
- [11] D. PANYUSHEV. Minimal inversion complete sets and maximal abelian ideals, *J. Algebra*, **445** (2016), 163–180.
- [12] D. PANYUSHEV and G. RÖHRLE. Spherical orbits and abelian ideals, *Adv. Math.*, **159** (2001), 229–246.

- [13] E. SOMMERS. B -stable ideals in the nilradical of a Borel subalgebra, *Canad. Math. Bull.*, **48** (2005), 460–472.
- [14] R. SUTER. Abelian ideals in a Borel subalgebra of a complex simple Lie algebra, *Invent. Math.*, **156** (2004), 175–221.

INSTITUTE FOR INFORMATION TRANSMISSION PROBLEMS OF THE R.A.S., BOLSHOI KARETNYI PER. 19,
127051 MOSCOW, RUSSIA

E-mail address: panyushev@iitp.ru